

UNPUBLISHED

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT**

RONALD EUGENE RICE,  
*Plaintiff-Appellant,*

v.

VICTORY MILLS,  
*Plaintiff,*

v.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL; UNITED STATES OF AMERICA; CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY; STATE OF ARKANSAS; SOUTHERN AIR TRANSPORT; ESTATE OF GEORGE W. BUSH; ESTATE OF WILLIAM FRENCH SMITH; EDWIN MEESE; RICHARD THORNBURGH; WILLIAM BARR; JANET RENO; ESTATE OF WILLIAM CASEY; ROBERT DEUTCH; GEORGE TENET; ESTATE OF WILLIAM JEFFERSON CLINTON; RAYMOND BUDDY YOUNG; DOES I-XXX,  
*Defendants-Appellees.*

No. 01-7273

Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the District of South Carolina, at Greenwood.  
G. Ross Anderson, Jr., District Judge.  
(CA-00-3937-9-17AJ)

Submitted: September 4, 2002

Decided: September 24, 2002

Before LUTTIG and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges, and  
HAMILTON, Senior Circuit Judge.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

### COUNSEL

Ronald Eugene Rice, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

---

### OPINION

#### PER CURIAM:

Ronald E. Rice<sup>1</sup> filed this action in the district court asserting government officials and agencies conspired to import and distribute cocaine in urban, African-American neighborhoods and subvert the profits to the Nicaraguan Contra movement. The district court, on the recommendation of the magistrate judge, dismissed the action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915A (2000), and revoked Rice's unvested good time credits under 28 U.S.C. § 1932 (2000).<sup>2</sup> Rice does not challenge the district court's conclusion that his claims were frivolous, so that portion of the district court's order is not properly before us. *See* 4th Cir. R. 34(b). Moreover, because the district court properly concluded that this action was malicious or was intended to harass the Defendants, notwithstanding Rice's self-serving statements to the contrary, we will not disturb the revocation of good time credits. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. *See Rice v. National Security Council*, No. CA-00-3937-9-17AJ (D.S.C. June 8, 2001). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions

---

<sup>1</sup>We previously dismissed the appeal of Rice's co-Plaintiff for failure to prosecute.

<sup>2</sup>There are two statutes designated as 28 U.S.C. § 1932; the district court's order involved the second § 1932.

---

are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

*AFFIRMED*